



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/644,542	08/20/2003	Christopher J. Bostak	200208755-1	6543

22879 7590 06/24/2005

HEWLETT PACKARD COMPANY  
P O BOX 272400, 3404 E. HARMONY ROAD  
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION  
FORT COLLINS, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

MIS, DAVID C

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2817

DATE MAILED: 06/24/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

H.A

<b>Response to Rule 312 Communication</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/644,542	BOSTAK ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	David Mis	2817	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

1. ☒ The amendment filed on 25 April 2005 under 37 CFR 1.312 has been considered, and has been:

a) ☐ entered.

b) ☒ entered as directed to matters of form not affecting the scope of the invention.

c) ☐ disapproved because the amendment was filed after the payment of the issue fee.

Any amendment filed after the date the issue fee is paid must be accompanied by a petition under 37 CFR 1.313(c)(1) and the required fee to withdraw the application from issue.

d) ☐ disapproved. See explanation below.

e) ☐ entered in part. See explanation below.

*The reasons for allowance have a typographical error, and should read: "... integrated circuit ...; ... proportional ... amplifier coupled to the output of the pass gate circuit ...", where claims 1 and 7 include in their context the "integrated circuit" limitation and where claims 11 and 15 include in their context the "proportional ... amplifier coupled to the output of the pass gate circuit" limitations. The prior art may or may not show much of that which is claimed but does not show at least that which has been indicated in the contexts of the claims. Reasons for allowance just simplify comparing prior art to the claims for those not having ordinary skill in the art, and does not redefine that which was intended to be covered by the claims at all.*

Attached: PTO-1449.



David Mis  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit: 2817